

REMARKS

By this amendment, claims 1, 3-5, and 8 have been amended. New claims 9-11 have been added. Claims 2 and 6-7 have been canceled. Claims 1, 2-5, and 8-11 are pending in the application. Applicants reserve the right to pursue the original claims and other claims in this and other applications.

Claims 1-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giobbi (US 6,749,510). This rejection is respectfully traversed. In order to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness "the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations." M.P.E.P. §2142. Giobbi does not disclose, teach, or suggest all limitations of independent claims 1 and 5.

To the contrary, Giobbi teaches a centralized game system, which is comprised of a central server system having a master game server storing a plurality of games, an executing server, which performs the execution of a game read from the master game server, a data base server obtaining a result of a game and generating a report, and a remote display terminal having CPU and a memory.

The Office Action contends in the central server system, the master game server and the executing server respectively correspond to the main system and the sub-system of the present invention. In Giobbi, however, the central server system 10 is connected to a plurality of remote display terminals 12, and in the central server system 10, the master game server loads a game play software into the game execution server, which executes the game play software and randomly selects an outcome.

On the other hand, as recited in claim 1, a communication game equipment unit is provided in a game center connected to a data server. Further, as recited in claim 5, a network communication game system is defined which includes a data server and a

game center connected to the data server via a communication network, and the game center includes a plurality of game equipment units.

Further, the communication game equipment unit of claims 1 and 5 has a main system having a main CPU, which executes a game controlled by a game program, and a communication sub-system having a sub-CPU, which executes a plurality of different communication function tasks.

At most, the communication game equipment unit of the claimed invention corresponds to a remote display terminal of Giobbi. Thus, the Office Action's contention is incorrect where it compares the master game server 14 and the executing server 16 of the central server system 10 with the main system and the communication sub-system of the claimed invention.

Applicants respectfully submit that Giobbi does not disclose, teach, or suggest the subject matter recited in claims 1 and 5. The assertion in the Office Action that "each server inherently includes a processor" does not remedy the deficiencies of Giobbi. Since Giobbi does not teach or suggest all of the limitations of claims 1 and 5, claims 1 and 5 are not obvious over the cited reference. Claims 3-4 and 8 depend, respectively, from claims 1 and 5, and are patentable at least for the reasons mentioned above, and on their own merits. Applicants respectfully request that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-8 be withdrawn and the claims allowed.

In view of the above amendment, Applicants believe the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 16, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas J. D'Amico

Registration No.: 28,371

Rachael Lea Leventhal

Registration No.: 54,266

DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP

1825 Eye Street NW

Washington, DC 20006-5403

(202) 420-2200

Attorneys for Applicants